

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS -P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,587	09/22/2003	Derek Tarrant	P00818-US-00 9653 (13929.0007)	
25267 7	590 07/14/2006		EXAMINER	
BOSE MCKINNEY & EVANS LLP			ANTHONY, JOSEPH DAVID	
135 N PENNSYLVANIA ST SUITE 2700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			AKTOMI	TALER NOMBER
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204			1714	
			DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006	DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		(<u>. </u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan.	10/667,587	TARRANT, DEREK			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Joseph D. Anthony	1714			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 A	<i>pril 2006</i> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 8-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 8-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objec drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/667,587 Page 2

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marsden U.S. Patent Number 5,500,093.

Marsden teaches a lubricating oil purifying device adapted to be installed in the flow line of lubricating oil passing into an oil filter, comprising a solid body made of acid-reactive material and having a central orifice in which a coupling ring is positioned, see abstract. The solid body which is made of an acid-reactive material such as magnesium, is in the form of a disk which preferably has perforations. When the oil passes through said perforated disk the acid in the oil is neutralized. A convention filter is used in conjunction with the acid reactive perforated disk, see column 1, line 60 to column 2, line 12. Applicant's claims are thus deemed to be clearly anticipated over the Marsden patent.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims

Application/Control Number: 10/667,587 Page 3

Art Unit: 1714

are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 8-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-9 and 16-22 of copending Application No. 10/924,392. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is massive overlap in the claimed subject matter.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Prior-Art Cited But Not Applied

5. Any prior-art reference which is cited on FORM PTO-892 but not applied, is cited only to show the general state of the prior-art at the time of applicant's invention.

Examiner Information

Application/Control Number: 10/667,587 Page 4

Art Unit: 1714

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Joseph D. Anthony whose telephone number is (571) 272-1117. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The centralized FAX machine number is (571) 273-8300. All other papers received by FAX will be treated as Official communications and cannot be immediately handled by the Examiner.

Joseph D. Anthony Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1714